19 38

Department of Revenue

OFFICE Y the Bd of Revenue

STATION Chepauk

Misc No. 3/4

F.1340/31

Dated 29-1-38

Pages in the file

(SUBJECT.)

Lett. - Relief. (J. Kumara) - Enhancement of Court

Calculation - Explanation of Th. Schedule

Association - Govt's reply Recorded

Revenue Department.

F-5540

SECY. 11 OCT 1937

BOARD OF REVENUE 11 OCT 1937 MADRAS

M E M O R A N D U M.

No. 3662 E/37-1, dated the 7th October 1937.

*****

Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara - Incorrect calculation of the average outturn of produce - Allegation.

The Board of Revenue is informed that a deputation of the South Kanara Landholders Association waited on the Hon'ble the Revenue Minister on 13th September 1937 and made certain representations relating to the re-settlement of that district. One of the allegations made by the deputation is that the average outturn of produce was incorrectly calculated at the time of the original settlement. The Board is requested to examine this allegation and submit a full report on the subject to the Government.

2. In this connection the Government observe that while offering its remarks on a similar complaint made at the time of the original settlement, the Board in paragraph 4 of its Proceedings No.165, dated 16th June 1905, stated that the number of the experiments made by the Deputy Commissioner of Settlement on good crops was much less than the number on middling and bad crops with the result that the standard outturns adopted for the first group were unnecessarily lowered and that in order to correct this error, the results of the experiments on bad crops were omitted from the calculations. The Board is requested to give detailed reasons for its view that the lower average could be rectified by excluding the experiments in respect of bad crops

K. Ramunni Menon,
Secretary to Government.

he Board of Revenue, Land Revenue and Settlement.

*****

F O R W A R D E D.
(By Order)

Superintendent.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for fair copying		
When copied		
When examined	17.11	Jus
When signed		
When despatched	DESPATCHED 17 NOV 1937	

SUBJECT :— Settlement — Result of Survey — Incorrect Calculation of the average outturn of Produce

All

READ AGAIN 1st, dated 19

" " " 19

READ *ALSO* :— No. F 5326/37 from the Memo from Govt. R.D. No. 3662-E/37-1 dt 7.11.37 — , No. , dated 19

" " " " 19

" " " " 19

Order / Resolution — Ms. / Rout. — No. , dated Ref. F 5326/37-1 dt 16.11.1937.

In para 1 of their Memo. read above the Govt. have stated that one of the allegations made by the deputation of the South Kanara Landholders Association which waited on the Hon'ble the Minister is that the average given of produce was incorrectly calculated at the time of the guarasmemu. The Board needs to be informed exactly what was contended that the outturn

Revenue Department.

No.3662-E/37-2.

From

B. G. Holdsworth, Esq., I.C.S.,

Secretary to the Government of Madras,

To

The Secretary,

The South Kanara Landholders' Association,

Mangalore.

Dated Fort St. George, the 8th January 1938.

Sir,

Subject:- Settlement - Resettlement - South Kanara Outturns - Calculation.

A deputation of your Association which waited on the Hon'ble the Revenue Minister on 13th September 1937, urged among other matters, that the average outturn of produce was incorrectly calculated at the time of the original settlement. At the time of that settlement it was found that instead of conducting an equal number of experiments on good, middling and bad crops on each description of land for the purpose of working out the average the Settlement Department had conducted a very small number of experiments on good crops compared to the number of middling and bad crops. This resulted in an unduly low outturn. After taking into consideration all the relevant factors, it was found that the omission of the experiments on bad crops from the calculations would result in an equitable figure for the outturn, approaching the figure

that would have been obtained had an equal number of experiments been conducted in the three kinds of crops.

2. This question was raised by your association at the time of the last resettlement of the district, but the Government after a very careful consideration of the question came to the conclusion that no action was necessary. I am to say that the Government have once again examined the question now but that they do not consider that there is any justification for reopening the matter.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

ur most obedient servant,

B. G. HOLDSWORTH?

TJVN.10/1~ Secretary to Government.

Copy to the Board of Revenue with reference to its Ref.No.F.5540/37-1, dated 16th November 1937.

Pf. 3-4 CT

Forwarded.

(By order)

A Ramachandra Rao 4.1.38

Superintendent.

[C.A. 14]

C.F. 16.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for fair copying		
When copied		
When examined		
When signed		
When despatched.		

SUBJECT:— Settlement - Result - South Kanara Dt - Outturns - incorrect calculation alleged on the S. Kanara Landholders' Association - Govt.'s reply -

READ AGAIN ____, dated Received 19____.

" " ____ " ____ 19____.

READ *ALSO*:—

No. F 5540/37 From the Govt. R.D, No. 36625/37-1 dated 7.X.1937 - Q

" F-286/38 " —Do— " —Do— 37-28-1. 1938 — Q

" ____ " ____ " ____ " ____ 19____.

~~Order~~ Ms. Resolution ~~Rout:~~ No. 314, dated 29-1-1938.

Received

E.P.R. 27.1.38

(to) 29/1/38

Copy to the Secy. to the Govt. R.D.

As (Sett)

As (Sett)

Please see the Govt. memo at pre. As the Govt. memo requires a study of the Sett. Khasra and the other later records, I request I may be granted time upto 22.10.37

E.P.R
20.10.37
Advocate
20/10

for
Advocate
20/10/37

As (Sett)

To As (Sett)

As I was busy with the drafting of the final report of the Board on the representations and objections on the proposals contained in the scheme report for the 2nd resett. of the northern talukas of the Salem Dt. I could not post the case on 22.X.37 as ordered above I request therefore that I may be permitted time upto 27.X.37.

Granted
for further time
Advocate
25/10/37

E.P.R
23.10.37
Advocate
25/10

X I have applied for Casual leave on 25th & 26th

As (Sett)

Settlement. Resettlement. (South Kanara). Incorrect calculation of the average outturn of produce. allegn

F 5340 /37 from the Govt. R.D.

TOAs (Sett)

Please see the memo from the Govt. Rev. Dept

Lie over orders obtained]

2. Paragraph 1 of the memo of the facts. That there was no error in the calculation of the average outturn of produce at the original settlement was fully dealt with in para '4' at p 50.8 and paragraph 4 at pp 516-517 of the Settlement Volume placed below the allegation regarding the incorrect calculation of the average outturn at the original settlement was raised at the resettlement. And the Board agreed with the G.O. that no consideration needed to be shown to the

allegation and informed the Govt.
accordingly in its proceedings.
Misc 3850 dy 26.10.34. In the
circumstances there seems
no need to examine now the
allegation and the attention of the
Govt. may be invited to BOP
misc 3850 dy 26.X.34. Favours.

of
below
and

(A)
[illegible]

Paragraph 2 of the memo.

— From paragraph 4
of BOP 65 dy 16.6.405, it will
be seen that the Board was
then convinced that the result of the average outturn,
obtained by omitting from
calculation the result of the
experiments on bad crops, was
sufficiently accurate for all
practical purposes. The Board
has now been asked to give
detailed reasons for its view that
the lower average could be reached
by excluding experiments in respect
of bad crops. As already pointed
out [illegible] by the Board, the average

The average outturn on each description of soil should be struck on the results of the same number of experiments on good, middling and bad crops. on that description of land. At the original Settlement, the Deputy Commr. for Settlement ~~have~~ has - it will be seen from the Statt. at p135 of the Sett. Volume placed below, Conducted 76 experiments on good 244 on middling and 296 on the bad crops. under class VII - 1.

The average was struck at 825 M.M for the total number of experiments. The question of the Govt. amounts to this viz whether if the 296 experiments conducted on bad crops are eliminated, The average will be higher than 825 M.M. This however is the case, is shown by the following Arithmetical Calculation

Good Crops	No of experiments.	Average	
	76	1378	

The total outturn is therefore

$76 \times 1378 = 104728$ M.M.

Middling Crops:- No of Experiments Aver.

244 96.

The total outturn is therefore equal to

244 x 967 M.M i.e. 23594

The total outturn on good and

middling is 104728

235948

340676

The average is equal to $\frac{340676}{320}$

= 1064 which

is greater than 825.

For orders whether the Govt.

may be informed of the calculation

made above showing that the lower

average can be rectified by

eliminating experiments in respect

of bad Crops. It is however submitted

that such a rectification can only be

taken to approximately

be accurate for practical purposes

as has been already taken by the Board.

First para of the Govt. Memo

PR

25.10.77

30

enclosed a copy of the representation

for have then indicated in what

manner the calculations of outturn at the time of the old sett were attacked by the deputation. From para 2 however it will be seen that the complaint is about the calculation of the average yield from the experiments and in food & middling crops. Vide items (ii) & (iii) at p. 7 of the Off. 'A' summarizes the objections of the ryots to the calculation of the averages. The objection is twofold (1) only the outturn in food & middling yields have been taken into account while those in bad yields have been ignored (2) in the calculation the "law of averages has been perverted". As regards (1) attention is invited to Sec. III Chap II of Lakshmikanta Rau's Settlement manual which requires that the quantity of a full, ordinary & indifferent crops should be ascertained. This has been done in the case of S. Canara but the Settlement Officer calculated the average outturn on the best wet land only by taking into account the food & middling crops. Para 83 of his report contains no reasons for the omission of the bad crops but this omission is supplied in para 4 of the Board's report on the memorials of the S. Canara Landholders to the time of the old sett where it is stated

that the a—— bad yield were not taken into account as the number of good experiments were fewer than the middling & bad. It would appear that there is ample justification for this procedure. As pointed out in Mr. Conchman's remarks on the objection, in every step of the calculation the averages have been in favour of the rents. The experiment were made in all the three groups of villages into which wet lands were divided whereas strict theory will demand that the out turn of a unit each group of village should be separately Calculated and the out turns fixed for 1st class wet lands have been deduced from experiments conducted on first, second & third class lands.

As regards the second objection regarding the method of calculation of the averages, it is true that the Board of Revenue Circular No. 117 (A) dated 1st March 1950 Para 43. P. 534 Ct. d Mr. Boudhion who conducted the scheme report for the Research of the Agricultural Scheme that his investigations did not support the version that there had been a fall in the out turns adopted since the previous settlement & that the standards adopted at the settlement were favourable to the ryots Para 8:- 1.13 Ms. Williams

settlement was based on the average of good & middling crops by dividing the total average yield of the two by two. Whatever merits the method advocated in para (iii) of the Madhavan Mathamaticals, it is obvious that the calculation of the averages in that manner is bound to fall easily against the Govt. as the no.

of experiments with modelling of wood results with disproportionately higher than the expenses on forest crops. The method followed is an by comm. though it may not be mathematically accurate is perhaps the equitable to adopt in the circumstances

for order

with reference to para 29 of the memo. attention is invited to the consolidated table of outturns given under para 16 at p. 260 of the Vol. below. It will be obvious from this statement that if the outturns on wood experiments alone were taken into account in the case of the 1st Forest Block, the resulting rate of assessment would be fixed higher than that actually adopted on the basis that the net outturn on the block was Rs 'over N.N.' The 'Govt's' attention may be invited to

[illegible]
6/11

I am afraid this is impossible to justify
the procedure adopted. Please see para 4
of p516 of the book. The argument here is
that the results were obtained by the good
but comparatively few experiments were
made on good crops. If it were the latter
would any be the case. If the total number
of all classes were added together and
then divided by the total number of
experiments. But this was not done.
A separate average was struck for middling and p134-136 of this vol
good, so that the number of experiments actually
made on each class was immaterial.

After this was done the average for good
this figure was struck and the averages para 43 p137 of this vol.
for good middling added together and divided
by two. The argument employed. para 4
of p576.7 entirely fails

This is apparently all that the Govt owns
to know. The Board may perhaps also
take note of the last sentence of para 4
of p577 of the book, that Mr Bowdich
thinks Grades (Cards) and the 16 general
knowledge of cotton in America as compared
with their detailing Members that of the
of the two last the 16 cotton adopted was
not based strictly on experience, it is
not sufficiently high. The Act is fully para 43 - p524 (T)

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~ with the division of the sum of 2 averages

by 2 seems indefensible on any theory!

~~[illegible]~~ simply

10 observations give av. 20 ~~[illegible]~~

100	10	1000
10	$\frac{30}{2} = 15$	$\frac{1200}{110} =$

~~[illegible]~~

And another 100 observations on 'bad' crops, say

100	5	500
10	$\frac{35}{3} = 11.6$	$\frac{1700}{210}$ 1!

This of course demonstrates how the average outturns were not "unnecessarily lowered" by omitting the experiments on "bad" crops; but it is a palpable fake to my mind.

We want to have the process actually adopted set out in complete detail; but of course the other considerations, as on the previous page, are conditioning factors. Perhaps we might first, however, ask Gall: Exactly how it was contended that the outturns were incorrectly calculated

JA 11/11

To Ashby

Orders above. Draft to Ld.

LS 13/11 13/11

JS 15/11/37 J.S(F)

Issued as Bd's ref. F 5324a/37-1 Dy 16.11.37
F 238b/38 from the Govt. R.D.

To As (Left)

Please see the Bd's ref at p 3c.7. and the Copy of the Govt.'s letter to the Secy. to the S. Kanara Land Holders Association with reference to the alleged incorrect calculation of the average outturn of produce for the S. Kanara Dt.

p 3c.6 ✗

2. As the Govt. have disposed of the allegation without waiting for the remarks of the Board, and as they have sent the Copy of their reply, to the Board with reference to its F 5324a/37-1 Dy 16.11.37, the papers may be recorded. No further action seems necessary

this may be done and a Copy of the BP submitted to Govt for their information.

BP Rh. Dy 1.38.

Ltd.

Dy 24/1

Dy 24/1

Dy 24/1

To As (Self)

As (Self)

Please see the notes and order on p13 nf. draft is subd. for approval

29/4/98

EFR
27/4/98

WB
28/4